



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

stillness within and stillness without. The sun breaks through the clouds and a tide of silver sweeps along the Avenue. The dim outlines of the Washington Monument can be seen as the silent men march by.

Why did they come, these great of the earth? Why did they come, these of the common walks of life? What thoughts are deepest in the minds of those who march and these who watch? What dreams are capturing the souls of men and women along this thoroughfare? Why did they come to stand in silence, and then to go again? Are they thinking of the pomp and color of war as they catch glimpses of the tall obelisk through the mist, or are they praying for peace? To answer these questions is to see in vision something of our new world, emerging out of the mist and the fog of misunderstanding and distrust.

Some come out of curiosity. The bands always draw a crowd. Uniforms and gold lace tickle the eyes. Not every day can one see the President and all his official family. The black casket is grim with mystery. The services at Arlington are filled with thrills. General Foch pins the Croix de Guerre upon the coffin; President Harding makes a speech. The sky clears and the sun warms cold hands and feet. Who would miss such a scene? It is beautiful, soul-stirring, majestic.

Some come because they want to see. Others come because their hearts are filled with sympathy. There are lonely homes and sad hearts along that line of march. Other soldiers have gone and never returned. This one symbolizes many; thousands can call him brother, husband, father, son. Tears are in many eyes and lumps are in many throats. The long procession winds its way toward the White House, while some talk glibly about this or that. The many keep still, because they sympathize. The heart of America is sad. The gigantic shape of Washington Monument comes more fully out of the fog.

Many come because they must. They are not like the curious. They see the uniforms, but oh, the tragedy of that dead boy! Freely you "Bared your breast to take the blow," but you were not to blame. The tides of youth ran high in you. You wanted to return, not like this, but to your own little boy, perhaps—your sweetheart, your mother. Craving life, yet freely offering it, you were denied the creative years of manhood.

Must it ever be so? Is there nothing else to challenge the heroism of men than the march, the battlefield, and the unknown soldier's grave? How we honor you and love you!

"Did you walk

In noble halls of learning, or follow plow
Through brown, sweet smelling furrows?"

It matters not; you are the best we breed. Must we ever breed our sons to kill and to be killed, and our daughters to shed their bitter tears in a war-lust-ridden world? If your lips could become vocal again, what would you say, Unknown Boy in your black coffin, with the President of your America walking close to your caisson?

The great gray monument is silent, with only the top hidden in the mist. The sun is shining from a clear sky and the ceremonies are over. The warriors of other lands have honored their countries by pinning their

crosses of honor over the silent breast of an American soldier. The President has uttered his words of prophecy, and the echoes of the firing squad have died away. The clear notes of "Taps" are still echoing in thousands of souls. The Unknown rests in his own home country.

The fog has gone and the Washington Monument stands like an eternal sentinel keeping guard over the Capital City. So may the warless age merge out of the fogs of all hates. And will it be so? Part of the answer must be written by the men who are here, at our President's invitation, to speak for their own lands concerning this dream that has vexed the seers and prophets of all the years.

And why do they come? Is it just because America invites them? Do they come out of courtesy only? Is there still the demand for the balance of power and the greed for open markets? Shall we merely reduce our navies, when battleships are becoming valueless against the airplane and gas bomb? These men from across the seas are among the mighty of the earth. Can they learn the lessons of the single-minded and the pure in heart? There is one argument greater than all the others. It reaches beyond the coaling stations in the Pacific and the undeveloped resources in the East. Today it wins conviction through all our land. *It is that dead and unknown soldier.*

Will the Conference sense it, and heed? If not, some day the peoples will speak and a new world will come to us out of the mists. Not forever will humanity stand idly by while little children call, as one cried on the Avenue today, "Oh, mamma, do you suppose it really could be papa?"

"The walls of division are falling;
Beware how you prop them up!
For Demos is in the saddle,
And he carries the world on the crup."

A WRONG SETTLEMENT ENDANGERING THE PEACE OF THE BALKANS

By N. J. CASSAVETES

WE ARE in the midst of the second reaction since the great war against all kinds of war. The conference at Washington seems to have brought about a reawakening of mankind to the perils of imperialism and old diplomacy. Yet, in the full light of a new day, which we earnestly hope will not darken into an evening of reactionary purposes, as at Paris, many shady things are happening at the side-show of the Conference of Ambassadors in the French capital.

On November 5 of this year the ambassadors of the European powers and Japan defined the Albanian frontiers and included into Albania the Greek Province of Northern Epirus. There is hardly another illustration as characteristic of the ruthless methods of European diplomacy as the question of Northern Epirus. This province, situated to the north of Greece and to the south of Albania, on the Adriatic, forms, with the Greek Island of Corfu, the Straits of Corfu, an excellent naval base that may challenge Italian efforts to monopolize the Adriatic Sea. The population of the province is 200,000, of whom 120,000 demand union with Greece and

80,000 with Albania. The two elements are so inter-mixed that it is impossible to unite the Greeks with Greece and the Albanians with Albania. At the suggestion of Mr. Venizelos, the Supreme Council at Paris drew a line of demarkation of frontiers between Greece and Albania calculated to compensate the latter country for the inclusion of 80,000 Albanians in Greek territory. This line of demarkation left to Albania 55,000 Greeks.

The experts of Great Britain, the United States, France, Japan, and Italy, in a report to the Supreme Council, accepted the settlement proposed by Mr. Venizelos as just and practical, and as a consequence the Supreme Council decided unanimously, on January 13, 1920, that Northern Epirus, including Korytsa, should be awarded to Greece. It was agreed orally, at the request of Italy, that Greece should not occupy the province until the final settlement of the Adriatic dispute.

The Adriatic issue was settled on November 12, 1920, and on the 14th of the same month Mr. Venizelos lost at the polls. The return of Constantine to the Greek throne was employed as a convenient justification of certain powers, especially Italy, to denounce the unanimous agreement of January 13, 1920, and to advocate the award of Northern Epirus to Albania. Of course, the return of Constantine to the Greek throne has not in the least altered the ethnic character of Northern Epirus, nor has it invalidated the right of the Greek Northern Epirotes to be united with Greece; nor are the Northern Epirotes responsible for the return of Constantine, for they did not participate in the recent Greek elections.

France, fearing that a united, strong Greece might be a valuable ally to Great Britain in the Near East, and Italy, anxious to drive Greece from the shores of the Adriatic, manifested their hostile attitude toward Greece on the question of Northern Epirus on every occasion. Great Britain, at late as July 11, 1921, declared, through her expert at the Conference of Ambassadors, that the Greek claim was just and would meet with the unqualified British support.

Then, on August 21, 1921, the *Temps* of Paris startled the diplomatic circles by an announcement that Great Britain had been won over to the Italian view on Northern Epirus. What had taken place between July 11 and August 21 of the same year? What had induced Great Britain to break her pledge to the Greeks? The Upper Silesian question was then at the white heat of debate. The vote of Italy could decide the issue in accordance with the British or with the French views. The Upper Silesian issue involved serious British interests; the Epirotic involved only justice and the rights of the Greek Epirotes; and Great Britain, of course, looked after her own interests. She bought the Italian vote on the Upper Silesian issue by selling her vote to Italy on the Epirotic question.

The settlement of the Epirotic question by the Conference of Ambassadors is not a matter involving the rights of the Northern Epirotes only. The very peace of the Near East depends upon the correct settlement of it. One cannot well understand the motives which actuated the ambassadors to reverse their own decisions and award Northern Epirus to Albania, unless he knows something about the policies and the views of Italy in the Adriatic.

In 1913, when Greece occupied Northern Epirus and Serbia reached the sea at Durazzo, Austria-Hungary demanded that the Serbian troops withdraw from Albania; Italy demanded the evacuation of Northern Epirus by the Greek troops. Austria-Hungary could not look complacently upon the aggrandizement of Serbia and the inevitable blocking of the Germanic road toward Constantinople and the Bagdad Railway. Italy was looking to a complete domination of the Adriatic. She entertained the hope that Southern Albania would fall to her when the time was mature for the partitioning of Albania. Northern Epirus, with the Island of Corfu, forms the important Straits of Corfu, not far from the entrance of the Adriatic. The Island of Corfu is Greek. Italy has been endeavoring since 1913 to prevent Greece from establishing herself on the Epirotic shores, and thus making the important Straits of Corfu Greek.

In 1913, at the Conference of London, the will of the Central Powers prevailed. Serbia and Greece were driven from the Adriatic. On January 13, 1920, France, Great Britain, and Japan induced Italy to assent to the award of Northern Epirus to Greece. Italy, in the belief that she would be able to hold Valona permanently, consented.

In July of 1920 the Albanians drove the Italian troops from Valona, and on August 2 of the same year an Italo-Albanian treaty was signed, whereby Italy recognized the independence of Albania and obtained in return possession of the Island of Sasseno, opposite the Port of Valona.

The news of the agreement of Tirana was not received without misapprehension by the Jugoslavs, as well as by the British. In possession of the Island of Sasseno, Italy can completely dominate the Adriatic and subject Austria, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Jugoslavia, and Albania to an Italian economic control.

Great Britain, in order to loosen the grip of Italy on the Adriatic, advocated persistently the award of Northern Epirus to Greece. Jugoslavia has sought to effect a rectification of her frontiers with Albania. Those frontiers, imposed upon Serbia in 1913 by the Central Powers, were so drawn as to leave important sections of the main railroad line of Serbia pass through Albania. It is evident that the Austrians aimed at preventing Serbia from building railroads leading toward the Adriatic.

The occupation of the Island of Sasseno by Italy re-opens the Adriatic issue. The Fiume dispute is removed from the head to the entrance of the Adriatic. The Jugoslavs cannot feel secure until either Italy is made to abandon Sasseno, or Greece, her ally, occupies Northern Epirus, or Jugoslavia herself occupies Northern Albania and comes into possession of San Jovani di Medua. The Jugoslavs and Austria, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia will seek an uncontrolled access to the sea. With Italy at Sasseno, these countries cannot be assured of a free access to the sea. There are, therefore, two alternatives for them to choose; to eject Italy from Sasseno or to seek in another direction access to the sea; and the only other direction is the *Ægean* Sea, through the Greek port of Saloniki.

The first alternative may be sought through a diplomatic effort, under the leadership of France. This event would drive Italy into the arms of Germany, and the

Central Alliance may be reconstituted, with the results which the world has witnessed during the recent years. The opening of a way to the sea through Saloniki will force Great Britain to come to the assistance of Greece. The Slavic descent upon the Ægean will not be tolerated by British policy. France will support the Slavs against Great Britain. The result may be the breach in the relations of the Franco-British Entente. In one word, the present unjust settlement of the Epirotic question unsettles everything in the Balkans, reopens the Adriatic issue and the Balkan strifes, and threatens to set the entire Near East into a new conflagration.

Nor is the possibility of an outbreak of a revolution in Northern Epirus, as in 1914, far distant. In 1914 the Northern Epirotes revolted against Albania. The results were autonomy for Northern Epirus and the dissolution of the Albanian State. A similar revolution to day would end in the complete ruin of Northern Epirus, the dissolution of the Albanian State, the participation of Greece on the side of the Northern Epirotes, the reoccupation of Valona by Italy, the occupation of Northern Albania by Serbia, and the beginning of a struggle between Yugoslavia and Greece on the one hand and Italy on the other. The latter will seek to drive her influence into the heart of the Balkans, while the former will seek to drive Italy out of the Balkans.

Thus the settlement of the Northern Epirotic question on the basis of justice is not only a matter of morality, but also a matter of ultimate interest, not only for the Balkans, but also for the world at large. The justice of the Epirotic question was recognized not only by the unanimous decision of the Supreme Council of January 13, 1920, but also by the unbiased and disinterested vote of the United States Senate, on May 17, 1920, and by the utterance of Mr. Harding, candidate for the Presidency, on October 24, 1920. Justice, and not temporary convenience, can bring about peace in the world; and justice cries for the union of Northern Epirus with Greece.

WAR AND THE TEACHING OF JESUS

By RUFUS M. JONES

This article is reprinted from the September issue of the *Christian Century*. In the current process of ridding ourselves of the war psychology, Mr. Jones' views will be stimulating in this Christmas season to many shades of Christian opinion.—THE EDITORS.

A DISTINGUISHED Christian scholar in one of our American divinity schools declared, during the intensity of the war strain, that he had got to the point where he could imagine Jesus dressed in khaki and sighting with his eye down the barrel of a rifle leveled at his enemy. Every word of the Galilean Master which could be used to give sanction to war was mobilized into service. It was, to be sure, a very thin collection of sayings and doings that was mustered out for this purpose, but they were used many times over and with considerable ingenuity. The scene at the cleansing of the temple, when the whip of small cords was used, rose to a place of almost supreme importance among the events of the great narratives. Very few readers seemed to notice, however, that no one of the synoptist writers referred to any whip, or that John implies that it was

used only for the sheep and the oxen. So meager were the available passages that most interpreters gave up trying to support their case with gospel texts and frankly resorted to the *ad hominem* method of declaring that Christ lived in an atmosphere of apocalyptic expectation, when the end of all things seemed near, and that if he had lived in our day, when the issues of evil had to be met, he would have spoken and acted very differently—in short, he would have been like other men if he had been in these hard circumstances!

LEVELING CHRIST DOWN

All this seems to me very doubtful exegesis. It is always sad to find it necessary to level Christ down to our standards. It is surely a sounder and truer method to admit honestly and sincerely that we have come to a crisis when we can no longer follow him, because he is too far above us, and that therefore, for the moment, we feel compelled to drop to a lower human standard, hoping that in happier times we may come back once more to his way of life. There are numerous texts in the Old Testament which approve of war, and if the preacher feels that he must give his blessing upon those who fight, let him brace his arguments for war by quotations from "them of old time," and let him leave Jesus untarnished, standing in his faith and purity and practicing, under circumstances as hard as any we have faced, a way of life which eliminates hatred and war. Let us endeavor to discover, if we can, his spirit and his method as they are expressed and exhibited in the gospels.

The constructive task laid upon our generation calls for something more than diplomacy and statesmanship. It calls for a rediscovery of spiritual energies that will rebuild the world. The new order of things which we hope and pray may rise out of the wreck of the old civilization, which has been ground in the awful millstones of war, can come forth into life and power only through the operation of positive spiritual forces on a greater scale than has ever been known before. I believe that there are new energies of life to be found in the primitive Christian gospel, taken seriously and practically as a way of life and a way of action. The gospel of Jesus Christ is not for Utopia—some dreamland built out of sheer imagination—but for this mixed world of ours. We have no way of knowing what other worlds are like. We search in vain for the scenery and conditions of life beyond our sphere of time and space. What we do possess is a luminous account of the laws and conditions that underlie and determine complete and perfect human life in this world where we are.

A PERFECT PERSONAL LIFE

The gospel presents first of all an actual instance of a perfect personal life. When we go back to the headwaters of Christianity we come not to a metaphysical theory, or a theological dogma, or a capricious fancy constructed out of exuberant hopes—we come to a personal exhibition of divine life revealed in human life, the eternal in the midst of time. We come to One who felt in his own consciousness union of mind and heart and will of God, and who was at the same time so truly of our nature that we see in him, as we see nowhere else, the goal and type of complete normal, spiritual life.